



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fw
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,182	12/28/2001	Mika H. Laaksonen	NOKI14-00017	4864
30973	7590	03/08/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P. 5956 SHERRY LANE SUITE 1400 DALLAS, TX 75225			JONES, HEATHER RAE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2616

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/036,182	LAAKSONEN, MIKA H.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Heather R. Jones	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 15, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on Page 8, lines 3-5 that the Sato reference fails to disclose adjustments that have been made after the data is input into the data unit. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sato discloses in Figs. 4A and 4B a flowchart of a program by which an image signal is read from the memory card and indicated on a display. The image processing order and the image data are read from the image file in steps 101 and 102. In step 111 it is decided whether or not any additional correction processes need to be done. If the answer is yes then the desired correction process is performed in step 112. After the process is performed the flow chart goes back to the S105 and eventually proceeds back to step 111. Once again it is decided whether or not any additional correction processes need to be done. If the answer is no then all the information is recorded in the memory card in steps 113 and 114. Therefore, Sato does disclose adjustments that have been made after the data is input into the data unit.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-24 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sato (U.S. Patent 6,650,365).

Regarding claim 1, Sato discloses in Figs 1 and 2 a data unit for storage of image or audio data so that an image or an audio presentation can be represented by representation means based on the data, the data unit comprising information regarding adjustments that have been made to the image or audio representation after the data was input in the data unit (col. 3, lines 56-62; Figs. 4A-4B).

Regarding claim 2, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing that the data unit comprises at least two fields (M1 and M2) such that the information is stored in a field (M2) that is separate from a field (M1) in which the data is stored (col. 3, lines 56-62).

Regarding claim 3, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 2 as well as disclosing the separate field (M2) comprises a comment field (col. 3, lines 56 – col. 4, line 5).

Regarding claim 4, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the data unit being adapted to

provide the representation means with information regarding changes that are to be made to the image or the audio presentation before representation thereof (Figs. 4A and 4B; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 5, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the data unit comprises compressed data (col. 3, lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 6, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing that the data unit comprises an image data field (col. 3, lines 56-62).

Regarding claim 7, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing the image data is stored in a lossy format (it is inherent that the data is stored in a lossy format when the image is compressed using the JPEG algorithm) (col. 3, lines 24-29).

Regarding claim 8, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the image data field comprises a JPEG file or similar (col. 3, lines 24-29).

Regarding claim 9, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 6 as well disclosing a data unit wherein the adjustments relate to one or more of the following adjustments: brightness of the image; contrast of the image; white balance of the image; gamma correction of the image; boundaries of the image; sharpening of the image; or quality of the image (Fig. 2; col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 15).

Regarding claim 10, Sato discloses a display device, comprising: a display means (36); a storage means (M) for storing image data associated with an image, the image data being included in an image data unit; and a processor means (41) for processing image data adapted to process image data based on information regarding adjustments that have been made to the image data after the data was input into the image data unit, the information being also included in the image data unit, the information being indicative of changes to be made to the image data before the image is displayed on the display means (Figs. 3, 4A and 4B; col. 4, lines 40-43; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 11, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 as well as disclosing a display device wherein the processor means is adapted to change at least one of the following features of the image based on the information included in the data unit: brightness of the image; contrast of the image; white balance of the image; gamma correction of the image; boundaries of the image; sharpening of the image; or quality of the image (Fig. 2; col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 15; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 12, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 including that the arrangement is such that the changes in the image to be displayed do not affect the image data stored in the data unit (It is inherent that the image data stored in the data unit is not affected since the processing order is read from the memory card and then applied to the

image before it displayed on the LCD) (Figs. 4A and 4B; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 13, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 as well as the processor means is adapted to modify the image based on information included in a comment field of the data unit (Figs. 4A and 4B; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 14, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 including a display device wherein the processor means is adapted to change the information indicative of the changes in the image (col. 6, lines 5-35).

Regarding claim 15, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 as well as disclosing that the display device comprises a portable device (the digital camera in Fig 1 is portable).

Regarding claim 16, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 including that the display device comprises a mobile station (the digital camera in Fig. 1 is mobile).

Regarding claim 17, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 including that the display device comprising a digital camera (Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 18, Sato discloses a method of displaying an image, comprising: storing image data associated with the image in a data storage means (Fig. 2; M2); storing, in the data storage means, information indicative of

modifications made to the image after storing of the image data so that the information can be fetched when the image is to be displayed by a display device; modifying the image based on the information; and displaying the modified version of the image (Figs. 4A and 4B; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 19, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 a method wherein the image data is stored in a compressed form an image data field of an image data storage unit and the information indicative of modifications is stored in another field of the image data storage unit (col. 3, lines 56-62).

Regarding claim 20, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 18 and 19 including that the other field comprises a comment field (col. 3, lines 56 – col. 4, line 5).

Regarding claim 21, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 18 and 19 including that the image data is stored in a lossy format (it is inherent that the data is stored in a lossy format when the image is compressed using the JPEG algorithm) (col. 3, lines 24-29).

Regarding claim 22, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 as well as disclosing a method wherein the modification comprises modification of at least one of the following features of the image: brightness of the image; contrast of the image; white balance of the image; gamma correction of the image; boundaries of the image; sharpening of the image; or quality of the image (Fig. 2; col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 15).

Regarding claim 23, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 as well as disclosing a method wherein the most recent information indicative of the modifications of the image is stored while the image data remains substantially unchanged after the image has been modified (It is inherent that the image data stored in the data unit is not affected since the processing order is read from the memory card and then applied to the image before it displayed on the LCD) (Figs. 4A and 4B; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 24, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 as well as disclosing a method comprising the steps of: dividing the image area into a plurality of image blocks before the step of storing the image data; compressing the image data in each of the image blocks separately; storing the compressed image blocks in the data storage means (it is inherent that within the JPEG compression process the image is divided into a plurality of blocks) (col. 3, lines 24-29); selecting at least one of the image data blocks to be fetched from the data storage means based on the information indicative of modifications; fetching the selected at least one image data block from the data storage means; decompressing the at least one fetched image data block; and displaying the content of the decompressed at least one image data block (Figs 4A and 4B; col. 5, lines 21-23).

Regarding claim 26, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 as well as disclosing a method wherein the

image is one of a plurality of images that are displayed in succession (it is inherent that the image is one of a plurality of images to be displayed when more than one image has been taken because the user may scroll through the saved images).

Regarding claim 27, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 18 and 26 including that each image of the plurality of images is provided with information indicative of modifications made to the image (as be seen from Fig. 2 each image has a comment field attached to the image field).

Regarding claim 28, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 18 and 26 as well as disclosing a method wherein at least one image of the plurality of images is provided with information indicative of modifications made to the image, and wherein at least one other image of the plurality of images is modified based on the information (it is inherent that at least one other image of a plurality of images is modified based on the information from another image; when a user finds the correct parameters to enhance an image for a particular venue then all the images taken at that venue would be taken using the same parameters).

Regarding claim 29, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 including that the image is displayed on a screen (LCD) of a portable display device (digital camera) (Figs. 1, 3, 4A and 4B; col. 5, line 12 – col. 6, line 35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (U.S. Patent 6,650,365).

Regarding claim 25, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18, however Sato fails to explicitly mention a method wherein the selection of the image data blocks is accomplished to adjust the size of the image area to be displayed. Official Notice is taken that cropping may be used to alter an image and that it is a well-known technique. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alter the size of the image to be displayed by using a cropping technique and saving this parameter in the comment field in order to display only a portion of the image to further enhance the details in that region of the original image. By saving a cropping parameter the original image would still be saved as well in order to allow the user to restore the image to its original shape at any point in time.

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Steinberg (U.S. Patent 6,510,520).

Regarding claim 30, Sato discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 except that the image data is transmitted to the display device over a wireless interface.

Referring to the Steinberg reference, Steinberg discloses a display device wherein the image data is transmitted to the display device over a wireless interface (42) (Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 18-32; the image data is transferred from the digital camera to the computer wirelessly).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have transferred image data over a wireless interface as taught by Steinberg in the Sato reference in order to allow one to transfer the images to a computer or other display device without the complication of wires running between the two devices.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather R. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

Application/Control Number: 10/036,182
Art Unit: 2616

Page 13

HRJ
March 1, 2006

MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TC 2600

Mehrdad Dastouri